<div align="center">

Remarks

</div>

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed February 15, 2008. No additional fee is due with this communication.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed February 15, 2008, Claims 1-49 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033535.

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 3-5, 13, 16-18, 26, 28, 30, 38, 40, 42, and 48, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-49. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-49 have been amended to satisfy the requirement under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action mailed August 28, 2007, Claim 1-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033535. Accordingly, Claims 1, 13, 26 and 38 have been amended as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that the claim as amended now conforms to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 103(a), and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is amended to define "*a plurality of first type servers, wherein each of the plurality of first type servers holds group information and access control list and includes an LDAP authentication server.*"

In the cited prior arts, Fisher discloses a common authentication protocol or proxy (CAP) server which includes an authentication interface that communicates with directory service authentication backends. (Paragraph [**0019**]). Specially, in Paragraph [**0023**], Fisher emphasizes that the CAP server obtains the user or user group information from an external source. In the pending Office Action, the Examiner admits that Fisher cannot anticipate the embodiment of Claim 1 in the present invention.

In addition, the embodiment in claim 1 provides the system administrator with means to manage their security database from a central point, the default security plugin and LDAP Authentication Server in the enterprise server. (Figure **1** and Paragraph [**0009**]). Since Fisher emphasizes that the CAP server obtains the user or user group information from an external source, it teaches away from managing security database from a central point, the enterprise server, while maintaining group information and access control list at the plurality of first type servers, or the application servers. Hence, it would not be obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to model or use Fisher to hold user or user group information on the CAP server (or the first type server) while maintaining other user security information in a data repository, based on Fisher.

For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that Fisher does not anticipate the embodiment of Claim 1 in the present invention or render the embodiment of Claim 1 in the present invention obvious. Therefore, independent 1 should be in allowable condition at least for the reason discussed above.

Furthermore, dependent claims 2-12 which are based on allowable independent claim 1 should all be in allowable condition at least for the reasons discussed above.

In addition, independent claim 13, 26 and 38 are similarly amended as in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits independent claims 13, 26 and 38 should also be in allowable condition for the reasons discussed above.

Furthermore, dependent claims 14-25 which are based on allowable independent claim 13; dependent claims 27-37 which are based on allowable independent claim 26; and dependent claims 39-49 which are based on allowable independent claim 38 should all be in allowable condition at least for the reason discussed above.

V.   Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Applicant believes that no fee is due with this communication. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: __April 11, 20008__   By: ___/Kuiran (Ted) Liu/_____

Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800